IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION No. 5:19-cy-249-FL

)	
MATTHEW BRADLEY,)	ANALYTICAL GRAMMAR, INC.'S
)	MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN
Plaintiff,)	SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR
v.)	LEAVE TO FILE A SURREPLY IN
)	RESPONSE TO MATTHEW
ANALYTICAL GRAMMAR, INC.,)	BRADLEY'S REPLY
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Analytical Grammar, Inc. ("Analytical") respectfully requests leave to submit the attached surreply to new arguments that Matthew Bradley ("Bradley") first aired in his reply papers in support of his motion for partial summary judgment (DE 35).

Bradley's reply (<u>DE 55</u>) largely relitigates arguments already raised in his motion and thoroughly refuted in Analytical's response (<u>DE 43</u>). He raises one new issue, however. Bradley requests that the Court strike evidence and arguments that Analytical raised to impeach and rebut his attacks on Analytical's license defense. *See* <u>DE 55</u> at 1-2 & 9, <u>DE 57</u>. For the reasons set forth in the attached surreply, Bradley's request to strike is procedurally improper and substantively unfounded, and should be denied accordingly.

"A party must seek leave of the court to file a surreply." *Johnson v. Allen*, 416 F. Supp. 3d 550, 564 (E.D.N.C. 2018). "The standard for granting a leave to file a surreply is whether the party making the motion would be unable to contest matters presented to the court for the first time in the opposing party's reply." *Lewis v. Rumsfeld*, 154 F. Supp. 2d 56, 61 (D.D.C. 2001). "[C]ourts generally allow a party to file a sur-reply 'only when fairness dictates based on new arguments raised in the previous reply." *McClary v. Lightsey*, No. 5:14-ct-3147-FL, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 152530, *11 (E.D.N.C. Nov. 3, 2016) (*quoting DiPaolo v. Potter*, 733 F. Supp. 2d

666, 670 (M.D.N.C. 2010)). Analytical satisfies this standard because Bradley's reply papers

presented his request to strike for the first time, and Analytical has had no chance to respond.

Bradley's request was procedurally improper. "A request for a court order must be made

by motion." Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1). Bradley's request is an improper "discovery motion" under

Local Civil Rule 7.1(c)(1) because it expressly seeks relief under Federal Rule of Civil

Procedure 37, without meeting the basic requirements of Local Civil Rule 7.1. See United States

v. \$307,900,000 in U.S. Currency, 156 F. Supp. 3d 708, 722 (E.D.N.C. 2016) ("to the extent

claimants' motion seeks a discovery sanction it is a 'discovery motion' ... Motions, such as

claimants' 'request' ... are to be separately filed and accompanied by a memorandum in support,

not embedded within responses") (citing Local Civil R. 7.1(d)). Had Bradley complied with the

governing rules and presented his request to strike by a distinct motion, not just within a reply

brief, Analytical would have filed a response brief rather than a surreply, and its instant motion

would have been unnecessary. His request to strike is also substantively baseless, as detailed in

Analytical's proposed surreply. For good cause shown, Analytical should be granted leave to file

its proposed surreply so that it can contest Bradley's new request to strike.

Therefore, and for the reasons further provided in the proposed surreply submitted

herewith, the Court should grant Analytical leave to file its proposed surreply or deem it filed as

proposed, consider it along with the summary judgment papers, and deny Bradley's request to

strike.

Respectfully submitted,

Analytical Grammar, Inc.

By its attorneys:

PPAB 5811287v1

Signed: August 27, 2020

/s/ <u>Dan Booth</u>
Dan Booth
Dan Booth Law LLC
60 Thoreau Street, #121
Concord, MA 01742
<u>dan@danboothlaw.com</u>
Local Civil Rule 83.1(e) Special Appearance

Christopher M. Thomas N.C. State Bar No. 31834 <u>christhomas@parkerpoe.com</u> Parker Poe Adams & Bernstein LLP PNC Plaza 301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1400 (27601) P.O. Box 389 Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-0389 Telephone: (919) 835-4626 Facsimile: (919) 834-4564

Local Civil Rule 83.1(d) Counsel

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will automatically send notification of such filing to the following:

> Albert P. Allan ALLAN LAW FIRM, PLLC 435 East Morehead Street Charlotte, NC 28202

Email: alallan@allaniplitigation.com

Richard Liebowitz LIEBOWITZ LAW FIRM, PLLC 11 Sunrise Plaza, Suite 305 Valley Stream, NY 11580 Email: RL@liebowitzlawfirm.com

This the 27th day of August, 2020.

/s/ Dan Booth Dan Booth Dan Booth Law LLC 60 Thoreau Street, #121 Concord, MA 01742 dan@danboothlaw.com Local Civil Rule 83.1(e) Special Appearance

Christopher M. Thomas N.C. State Bar No. 31834 christhomas@parkerpoe.com Parker Poe Adams & Bernstein LLP **PNC Plaza** 301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1400 (27601) P.O. Box 389 Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-0389 Telephone: (919) 835-4626 Facsimile: (919) 834-4564

Local Civil Rule 83.1(d) Counsel